



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/230,001	05/18/1999	EVERT BASTIAAN DE HEUS	MULLE20.001A	5036

20995 7590 08/13/2002

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP  
620 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE  
SIXTEENTH FLOOR  
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660

EXAMINER

THORNTON, KRISANNE MARIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1744

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2002

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/230,001

Applicant(s)

DE HEUS, EVERT BASTIAAN

Examiner

Krisanne M. Thornton

Art Unit

1744

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 16 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recitation of "the inner boiler" and "said cylindrical boiler", respectively, within these claims is found to lack proper antecedent basis.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-6, 9-12 and 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kalasek in view of the Applicant's admission of the state of the prior art.

Kalasek teaches a double-walled boiler sterilization apparatus having computer controlled, timed actuation, with a fluid reservoir provided between the sterilization chamber and an outer wall with heating means there. Placement of the sterilization chamber is concentric, but offset within the outer wall. Kalasek is silent of to the volumetric dimensions of the apparatus.

Page 1 of the instant specification sets forth that volumes of from 10 to about 50 liters are conventional in the art of ministerilizers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to configure the apparatus of Kalasek within conventional volume dimensions of ministerilizers, as supported in Applicant's admission of the state of the prior art, for their known and effective application for point of use sterilization, such as in a dentist's office.

Kalasek teach square or rectangularly shaped structures, however it would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a cylindrical shape therefore, as cylindrical sterilization structures are conventional in the art, and mere changes in shape are not held to be patentable distinctions. It is further noted that the use of demineralized water in steam sterilizers is well known and expected because it minimizes the occurrence of mineral deposits from condensate within the structure that would deter optimal effectiveness of the apparatus.

Art Unit: 1744

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kalasek and Applicant's admission of the state of the prior art, as applied to claims 1-6, 9-12 and 14-22 above, and further in view of Brucker WO 92/01479.

Brucker teaches the use of lateral supports within a boiler sterilizer for support of articles to be sterilized as well as, the utilization of a hinged, sealing door for operation of the apparatus.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the lateral supports of Brucker in the structure of Kalasek because it would clearly allow for the sterilization of an increased number of articles simultaneously, and it would further have been obvious to utilize door means as those in Brucker for the purpose of sealingly enclosing the structure to optimize containment of sterilizing medium and temperature maintenance.

### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krisanne M. Thornton whose telephone number is 703-308-3914. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Wed. 6:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert J. Warden can be reached on 703-308-2920. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-

Art Unit: 1744

305-7718 for regular communications and 703-305-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

  
KRISANNE THORNTON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
August 12, 2002